REMARKS

Claims 1, 10, 12, 21, 22 and 25 have been amended, claims 3-5 and 20 have been withdrawn, and new claim 27 has been added. The other claims remain unchanged. No new subject matter is believed to have been added by this Amendment.

In Section No. 2 of the Office Action, the Examiner indicates that claims 3-5 and 20 are withdrawn. However, it should be noted that each of these is a claim either directly or indirectly dependent upon independent claim 1 and, to the extent that independent claim 1 is allowed, then the withdrawal should be retracted and each of these claims should be returned to the present application.

In Section No. 4 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejects claim 10 under 35 U.S.C. § 112 second paragraph, as being indefinite. Claim 10 has been amended to specify that the safety plate in subparagraph c) is adjacent to the at least one roller of the lower trolley.

In Section No. 6 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejects claims 1, 2, 6-11, 13-16 and 20-26 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious from the teaching of United States Patent No. 3,513,783 to Mayfield, et al. (the "Mayfield patent"), in view of the teaching of United States Patent No. 4,564,087 to Hass (the "Hass patent"). The Mayfield patent is directed to a railway freight car wherein, as illustrated in Figs. 9-11, a plug-type sliding door 5 is supported on door mounting shafts 72 which rest upon roller carriages 77 at the bottom of the door 5. Trolleys 51 guide the mounting shafts 72 but do not provide any vertical support. Additionally, the Hass patent is directed to a double panel sliding door wherein, as illustrated in Fig. 3, a safety plate 4.3 captures roller 14, thereby preventing it from leaving the guiding rail 4.1. There is no projection extending within the groove of the roller 14 to retain it.

The subject invention is directed to a trolley system for positioning the door of a railway boxcar to cover or uncover an opening in a wall of the railway boxcar comprising an upper track mounted upon the railway boxcar and an upper trolley having a body with at least one roller rotatably secured therein, as illustrated in Figs. 3 and 5 of the subject application. The at least one roller of the upper trolley is adapted to support the weight of the door and the at least

Application No. 10/809,186 Paper Dated: March 14, 2006

In Reply to USPTO Correspondence of September 14, 2005

Attorney Docket No. 4253-040072

one roller rests upon the upper track. This arrangement, whereby the weight of the door is supported from the upper trolley, is a departure from the standard designs of railway boxcar doors, whereby a lower trolley supports the weight of the door and, an upper guide retains the door in a proper position as it is moved along the lower trolley. Not only in the subject invention does the upper trolley support the weight of the door, but a safety plate is utilized which physically limits vertical movement of the roller in the upper trolley to prevent derailment. Neither the Mayfield patent or the Hass patent teach or suggest these features as applied to the door of a railway boxcar. Claim 1 of the subject application has been amended to highlight these features and, as such, claim 1 is believed to be patentably distinct over the teaching of these two references and the other prior art of record.

Independent claims 21, 22 and 25 have been amended in a fashion similar to that of claim 1 and, for reasons previously discussed with respect to claim 1, are themselves believed to be patentable over the prior art of record.

By way of their dependence upon what is believed to be patentably distinct independent claims 1, 22 and 25, dependent claims 2, 6-11, 13-16 23, 24 and 26 are themselves believed to be patentably distinct over the prior art of record. Furthermore, claims 10 and 12 have been amended to specify that the at least one roller of the lower trolley is adapted to support the weight of the door and rests upon the lower track, as illustrated in Fig. 3.

In Section No. 7 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejects claims 1, 2, 6-11, 13-17, 19 and 21-26 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious from the teaching of United States Reissue Patent No. 28,443 to Ross Jr., et al. (the "Ross patent") in view of the teaching of the Hass patent. The Ross patent is directed to an over-travel and return mechanism for a door which, as illustrated in Fig. 1, includes a plug-type door assembly 14 mounted upon shafts 30, 32. The bottom of each of these shafts is supported by roller assemblies 36, 37, which rest upon a track section 42. The top of the shaft members 30, 32 is laterally supported by arms 38 attached to guide rollers 40 which ride within a guide way 44. However, these rollers 40 do not provide any vertical support. As previously mentioned with respect to the subject invention, independent claims 1, 21, 22 and 25 have been amended to highlight that the upper trolley is adapted to support the weight of the door and, wherein the at least one roller of the upper trolley rests upon

{W0202759.1}

Application No. 10/809,186

Paper Dated: March 14, 2006

In Reply to USPTO Correspondence of September 14, 2005

Attorney Docket No. 4253-040072

the track. This feature, in conjunction with the safety plate specified in each of these claims, is

believed sufficient to patentably distinguish these claims from the prior art of record. Once

again, by way of their dependence upon what is believed to be patentably distinct independent

claims, dependent claims 2, 6-11, 13-17, 19, 23, 24 and 26 are themselves believed to be

patentably distinct over the prior art of record.

In Section No. 8 of the Office Action, the Examiner indicates that claims 12 and

18 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim but would be allowable if

rewritten in independent form. The Applicant believes that claim 1, as amended is patentably

distinct but retains the option of rewriting claims 12 and 18 in independent form.

New independent claim 27 has been added, which includes the limitation of

originally filed claims 1 and 4. The feature of independent claim 4 is clearly illustrated in Fig. 3

as reference number 72 and is featured in conjunction with the upper trolley adapted to support

the weight of the door is believed to define over the prior art of record.

Reconsideration of pending claims 1, 2, 6-19, and 21-26 and allowance of claims

1, 2, 6-19, and 21-27 are respectfully requested.

Very truly yours,

THE WEBB LAW FIRM, P.C.

J/ames G. Porcelli

Registration No. 33,757

Attorney for Applicant

700 Koppers Building

436 Seventh Avenue

Pittsburgh, PA 15219

Telephone: (412) 471-8815

Facsimile: (412) 471-4094

{W0202759.1}

11